REMARKS

By the foregoing amendments the specification has been amended on page 1 to update the status of the parent application and claims 22, 29, 30 and 31 have been amended. Thus, claims 22-31 remain in the application.

The amendment filed October 21, 2003 was objected to in the outstanding Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §132 because it allegedly introduces new matter into the disclosure. Claims 22-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement for the reasons stated on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. This objection and rejection are hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and Applicant's remarks set forth below.

In the objection and rejection, it was stated that the added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is the expression "a zero offset adjusting input of the arrangement" "being operatively connected to" the output of the further storage unit in claim 22. Claim 22 was also objected to as including a "further storage unit" which is not described in combination with another "storage unit". Responsive to the objection and rejection, the objectionable language "a zero offset adjusting input of the arrangement" in claim 22 has been deleted and the claim amended to recite that the output of the further storage unit is operatively connected to a nulling input of the comparing and amplifying unit. This is in reference to the embodiment of the invention shown in Figure 5 of the drawings wherein the storage unit 27 is the further storage unit referred to in the claim, and its output is operatively connected, at 28, to a nulling input of the comparing and amplifying unit 23,

25, of the test arrangement analysis unit as described on pages 8 and 9 of the specification. In the example embodiment, the nulling input of the comparing and amplifying unit is an input of amplifier 25 of comparing and amplifying unit 23, 25.

Claim 22 is also been amended to positively recite a "storage unit" in combination with the "further storage unit". The storage unit refers to storage unit 13 in Figure 1 which stores an electrical output signal from sensor 11 as signal el_0 for comparison with the electrical output signal el from sensor 11. As described in connection with the embodiment of Figure 5, and in original claim 9 and on page 4 of the specification, the storage unit can comprise an analog to digital converter and a digital to analog converter, 21a and 21b, respectively, as shown in Figure 5. As explained on page 4 of the specification, a stationary output signal of this analog to digital converter, or in combination of analog to digital converter and digital to analog converter, is used as a reference value for the subsequent analysis of the sensor output signal.

Regarding claim 31, and the allegation that the limitation "control unit enabling said storage unit and said further storage unit substantially simultaneously" is not originally described in the disclosure, claim 31 has been amended to employ the exact language in the specification "essentially as the same time", see page 9, line 10. This is in reference to the time control unit referred to on page 6, line 6, not shown in Figure 1, but represented by timing signal generator 29 in Figure 5 which enables the storage unit 21 and the further storage unit 27 essentially at the same time as discussed in the application specification.

In view of these changes, it is respectfully submitted that the objection under 35 U.S.C. §132 and rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph have been overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal thereof is requested.

Claims 22, 23, 28 and 31 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuse, U.S. 4,670,847, in view of Delatorre et al., U.S. 3,800,586, as stated on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action. Claims 24-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuse as modified by Delatorre et al., and further in view of Hass et al., U.S. 3,987,664 as stated on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action. Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuse as modified by Delatorre et al. and applied to claim 22 and further in view of Massage, U.S. 3,837,215, and Chaud et al., U.S. 3,733,488, as stated on page 6 and 7 of the Office Action. These rejections are hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and Applicant's remarks set forth below.

It is acknowledged in the rejection of claims 22, 23, 28 and 31 that the primary reference to Furuse does not expressly recite the output of the comparator being operatively connected to a further storage unit. It was also stated in the rejection of claims 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph that the last clause of claim 22 reciting "the output of said further storage unit being operatively connected to a zero offset adjusting input of the arrangement" was not considered with respect to the prior art. That is, because the feature of feeding back the signals from the output of the further storage unit was not considered in the rejection, the cited references to

Furuse and Delatorre were considered relevant. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Furuse and Delatorre are not relevant since this feature is originally disclosed by Applicant and properly claimed in the claims as amended. The application claims are believed to properly recite such features of the testing arrangement of the present invention which, as admitted, are not shown or described by Furuse.

The secondary reference to Delatorre does not provide for the deficiencies of Furuse. In Delatorre et al. the zero circuit 52 first reaches zero and only then actuates the first timer 58, column 4, lines 52-54. In contrast, in the test arrangement of the invention simultaneous or substantially with storing the electric output signal of the pressure sensor the electrical output signal of the sensor and the storage signal are applied to the inputs of the comparison unit and a zero reference signal is produced therewith. This occurs at the beginning of the measuring time interval in the example embodiment. The Delatorre et al. circuitry and operation are different from Applicant's claimed testing arrangement. The secondary references to Hass, Massage and Chaud et al. likewise do not provide for the deficiencies of Furuse and Delatorre et al.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to

Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 635.32872VV5) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald J. Shore
Registration No. 28,577
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

RJS/kmh

Attachments